

The Examiner has objected to the claims because the lines are crowded too closely together. Applicant herewith submits a clean set of amended claims having the proper line spacing.

In the Claims:

Please delete claim 2.

Please amend claims 1, 3-9 and 11-15 as provided. Both clean and marked-up versions of the amended claims are included herewith.

REMARKS

The Office action dated July 15, 2002 is acknowledged. Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are pending in the instant application. According to the Office action, claims 1-9 and 11-15 have been rejected. By the present "Reply to First Office Action," claim 2 has been deleted and claims 1, 3-9 and 11-15 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments being made hereby and of the following remarks.

The specification has been re-examined for any further minor errors. Applicant has corrected all errors of which Applicant has become aware. In this regard, a substitute Table 1, found at page 6 of the specification, is attached herewith in both clean and marked up versions.

Rejection of Claims 2, 5 & 13-15 Under U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2, 5 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Examiner states that claim 2 is in improper Markush group format and that it is unclear to which polymers the claimed